

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-18 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are independent. Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's allowance of claims 4, 7, 12, 14, 16/7, 16/14, 17/4, 17/7, 17/12 and 17/14. It is noted that claim 18/16 depending from claim 4 and claim 18/16 depending from claim 12 should have been indicated to be allowed because these claims depend from allowed claims 4 and 12.

In this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, and 12-16 have been amended to clarify the present invention. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Entry of the present Amendment is solicited pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

**Claims 1, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16/10, 16/15, 17/1, 17/8, 17/10, 17/13, 17/15 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mukawa et al.**

**Independent Claim 1**

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner maintained his position that Mukawa et al. teach the claimed optical integrator. However, Applicants submit that Mukawa et al. do not disclose an illuminating device including all the limitations recited in claim 1. Specifically, Mukawa et al. do not disclose, at a minimum, that the "optical integrator" is "disposed on an axis of the mixed light," as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner asserted that optical systems 14, 58 and polarizer 59 of Mukawa et al. are disposed on the light exit side of the light mixing means (see Fig. 8). However, Mukawa et al. do not teach disposing those elements 14, 58 and 59 on an axis of the mixed light. Accordingly, Mukawa et al. do not disclose an illuminating device including all the limitations recited in claim 1.

Independent Claim 8

The Examiner asserted that Mukawa et al. teach, among other things, that “light emitted from said auxiliary light source is condensed in the concave portion of the concave reflecting element and in the vicinity of the light emitting point of said white light source,” as recited in independent claim 8.

However, Applicants note that the Examiner did not properly consider the amendment made to claim 8 in the June 7, 2006 Amendment. Fig. 1 of Mukawa et al. shows that the light from semiconductor laser 7 is condensed outside of reflector 9. Accordingly, Mukawa et al. do not teach that “light emitted from said auxiliary light source is condensed in the concave portion of the concave reflecting element,” recited in claim 8 (emphasis added). Thus, Mukawa et al. do not disclose an illuminating device including all the limitations recited in claim 8.

Independent Claim 13

The amendment made to independent claim 13 in the June 7, 2006 Amendment was not properly considered by the Examiner. Mukawa et al. do not teach, at a minimum, “an optical member having a plurality of optical elements disposed with spaces therebetween for respectively introducing the light emitted from said first light source in a direction,” and “a second group of light sources respectively arranged in the spaces, and respectively emitting nearly parallel light in the direction,” recited in claim 13 (emphasis added).

The Examiner identified flyeye lenses 10A and 10B of Mukawa et al. (see Fig. 8) as the claimed optical elements, and Mukawa’s laser 7 and LED 57 as the claimed group of light sources. However, Mukawa et al. does not teach disposing laser 7 and LED 57 in spaces between flyeye lenses 10A and 10B. Accordingly, Mukawa et al. do not disclose an illuminating device including all the limitations recited in claim 13.

Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 10, 15, 16/10, 17/1, 17/8, 17/10, 17/13 and 17/15 are considered patentable because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 8 and 13, respectively.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that Mukawa et al. do not disclose an illumination device including all the limitations recited in claims 1, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16/10, 16/15, 17/1, 17/8, 17/10, 17/13, 17/15 and 18. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and favorable consideration thereof.

**Claims 3, 5, 16/3, 16/5, 17/3, 17/5 and 17/6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukawa et al. in view of Wichner et al.**

Applicants submit that the applied combination of Mukawa et al. and Wichner et al. does not teach an illuminating device including all the limitations recited in independent claim 13. Specifically, the references do not teach, at a minimum, that “the auxiliary light source includes a plurality of solid-state light sources respectively emitting parallel light, the plurality of solid-state light sources arranged substantially along an opening edge of the concave reflecting element,” recited in amended claim 13.

It is apparent that Mukawa’s laser 7 and LED 57 are not arranged substantially along the opening edge of reflector 8. Wichner et al. do not teach such arrangement of a plurality of solid-state light sources, and thus, do not cure the deficiency of Mukawa et al.

Accordingly, the applied combination of Mukawa et al. and Wichner et al. does not teach an illuminating device including all the limitations recited in independent claim 13. Dependent claims 5, 16/3, 16/5, 17/3 and 17/5, as well as claim 18/16 are also considered patentably distinguishable over Mukawa et al. and Wichner et al. at least because these claim respectively

include all the limitation recited in independent claims 1 and 3. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and favorable consideration thereof.

**Claims 9, 11, 16/11, 17/9 and 17/11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukawa et al. in view of Kudo.**

Regarding independent claim 9, the Examiner admitted that Mukawa et al. do not teach, among other things, that “the aspect ratio of the light incidence surface of the rod prism and that of a light emission surface of the rod prism are substantially the same as the aspect ratio of an object to be illuminated.” However, the Examiner asserted that rod-like optical member 40 of Kudo corresponds to the claimed rod prism.

Applicants submit that Mukawa et al. and Kudo do not teach an illumination device including all the limitations recited in claim 9. Specifically, the applied combination of the reference does not teach, at a minimum, that “the aspect ratio of the light incidence surface of the rod prism and that of a light emission surface of the rod prism are substantially the same as the aspect ratio of an object to be illuminated,” recited in claim 9.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Kudo teaches the claimed aspect ratio by relying upon references 40 and R in Fig. 7. However, the Examiner did not provide why a light emission surface of optical member 40 is substantially the same as the aspect ratio of an object to be illuminated.

Accordingly, the applied combination of Mukawa et al. and Kudo does not teach an illumination device including all the limitations recited in claim 9. Dependent claims 9, 11, 16/11, 17/9 and 17/11 are also patentably distinguishable over Mukawa et al. and Kudo at least

because the claims include all the limitations recited in independent claim 9. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and favorable consideration thereof.

### Conclusion

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida

Limited Recognition No. L0098

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 AJS:TT:lnm  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: October 23, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**